

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the present application. Claims 8-35 are allowed, Claims 1-5, 7, and 36-44 stand rejected, and Claim 6 is objected to. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7, and 36-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,290). These claim rejections are respectfully traversed.

Yoshida et al. discloses an optical output power control circuit 4 that is capable of reducing overshoot of the optical output power of a light emitting diode (LED), along with a cutoff control circuit 14 that reduces an input voltage to zero volts according to a cutoff signal. More specifically, the optical output power control circuit 4 provides a rise from zero volts, to a set voltage, slowly according to the time constant of the low-pass filter 16, to produce no overshoot. As to the cutoff control circuit 14, it does just that, cuts off the voltage, from the set voltage to zero, without the use of any scaling function. Simply stated, Yoshida et al. merely discloses control circuits that provide two states, namely: (1) zero volts; and (2) a set voltage. As such, there is no disclosure or teaching in Yoshida et al. of any function whatsoever that limits power to a value less than full line voltage, let alone through the use of a scaling function. Moreover, an LED is not a heat-producing element, and as such Yoshida et al. does not disclose or teach a heat-producing means.

Claims 1-5, 7, and 36-44 each require a power limiting function that limits wattage (Claims 1-5, 7) or power (Claims 36-44) to a value less than that produced at full line voltage through the use of a scaling function. As set forth above, Yoshida et al. merely changes the voltage between a value of zero and a set voltage and does not disclose or teach any power limiting function or a scaling function. Moreover, Yoshida et al. does not disclose or teach a heat-producing means, as required in Claims 1-5 and 7. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Claims 1-5, 7, and 36-44 cannot be anticipated and respectfully request that the outstanding claim rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1216.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 28 AUG 06

By: Kelly L. Burris
Kelly Burris, Reg. No. 46,361

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

KKB/lrw